

Attorney Docket: 060258-0271467
Client Reference: 2980603US/A/KO



11w

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of: TIMO
KAUHANEN, ET AL.
Application No.: 09/600,083

Confirmation Number: 6680

Group Art Unit: 2681

Filed: September 13, 2000

Examiner: Nguyen, Huy D.

Title: CONTROL OF A MULTICALL IN A TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendments
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated February 27, 2006, please reconsider the patentability of the pending claims based on the following remarks.

Although the Office Action deemed claim 17 to include allowable subject matter, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 9, 11-12, 18, 23 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grube et al. (U.S. 5,371,898; hereafter "Grube"), rejected claims 2-6, 8, 10 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube in view of Fapojuwo (U.S. 6,212,389), rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube in view of Ho et al. (U.S. 6,314,292; hereafter "Ho"), rejected claims 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube in view of Hoogerwerf et al. (U.S. 5,819,171; hereafter "Hoogerwerf"), rejected claims 15-16 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube in view of Tuulos (U.S. 5,625,879), rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube in view of Fapojuwo and Ho, and rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube in view of Ahvenainen (U.S. 5,852,781).

Applicants traverse the prior art rejections because the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims. For example, the applied prior art fails to provide "setting up any new call in an existing multicall over the transmission path between the telecommunications network and the subscriber terminal," as recited in claims 1-